



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VII.—ΥΠΟΚΡΙΤΗΣ AND ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΣ IN SCHOL. DEM.
DE PACE 6.

In the early part of his oration *On the Peace*, delivered in 346, Demosthenes reminds the Athenians of a number of occasions on which it would have been better for them to have followed his advice instead of that of interested counsellors. In § 6 he comes to the case of Neoptolemus, the famous tragic actor, whose representations about Philip had helped to determine the policy of the Athenians in connection with the Peace of Philocrates :

πάλιν τοίνυν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατιδὼν Νεοπτόλεμον τὸν ὑποκριτήν, τῷ μὲν τῆς τέχνης προσχήματι τυγχάνοντ' ἀδείας, κακὰ δ' ἐργαζόμενον τὰ μέγιστα τὴν πόλιν, τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν διοικούντα Φιλίππῳ καὶ πρυτανεύοντα, παρελθὼν εἶπον εἰς ὑμᾶς, οὐδεμιᾶς ἰδίας οὔτ' ἔχθρας οὔτε συκοφαντίας ἔνεκα, ὥς ἐκ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτ' ἔργων γέγονεν δῆλον. καὶ οὐκέτ' ἐν τούτοις αἰτιάσομαι τοὺς ὑπὲρ Νεοπτόλεμου λέγοντας, οὐδὲ εἰς γὰρ ἦν, ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς· εἰ γὰρ ἐν Διονύσου τραγῳδοῦς ἐθεᾶσθε, ἀλλὰ μὴ περὶ σωτηρίας καὶ κοινῶν πραγμάτων ἦν ὁ λόγος, οὐκ ἂν οὕτως οὔτ' ἐκείνου πρὸς χάριν οὔτ' ἐμοῦ πρὸς ἀπέχθειαν ἤκούσατε.

Modern commentators on the last sentence have generally overlooked the implied compliment to Neoptolemus as an actor, to whose powers the Athenians could not be blamed for yielding. If the occasion had been an exhibition of tragedies, the rival actors being Neoptolemus and Demosthenes, the Athenians' approval of the former would not have been due, as Demosthenes thinks it was (οὕτως), to prejudice in his favor and against Demosthenes; they would have been wholly justified in preferring Neoptolemus. But it was, in fact, a debate on a matter of vital import to the state, and the actor's charm of voice and manner should have had no influence in the decision. Demosthenes blames the Athenians for applying false standards of judgment to matters of statesmanship.¹ One is reminded of the soreness

¹ The last part of the scholium to the passage, attached to *Νεοπτόλεμον* above, seems to indicate that the ancient commentator had the right interpretation; but in its present form the note is corrupt, due possibly to the taking over of οὐκ from the οὐκ ἂν ἤκούσατε of the text. In its original form it probably ran about as follows: θέλει δὲ εἰπεῖν ὅτι [οὐκ] "ἤκούσατε τοῦ Νεοπτόλεμου ὥσπερ ἐν

which he often betrays, in the orations *On the Crown* and *On the Embassy*, in alluding to the fine voice and histrionic ability of Aeschines. Arist. Rhet. III 1403 b, 30, reads almost like a commentary on the charge made by Demosthenes: *ἔστιν δὲ αὐτῇ* (i. e., *ὑπόκρισις*) *μὲν ἐν τῇ φωνῇ. . . . τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα σχεδὸν ἐκ τῶν ἀγώνων οὗτοι* (i. e., those who possess these qualities of voice) *λαμβάνουσιν, καὶ καθάπερ ἐκεῖ μείζον δύνανται νῦν τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ ὑποκριταί, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς πολιτικούς ἀγῶνας διὰ τὴν μοχθηρίαν τῶν πολιτῶν* (Spengel, *πολιτειῶν* MSS).

To the word *ὑποκριτὴν* in the text of the passage from *De Pace* quoted above is attached an old note in the MSS; it reads as follows:

ὑποκριτὰς ἐκάλουν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι τοὺς νῦν τραγῳδοὺς λεγομένους, τοὺς ποιητὰς, οἷον τὸν Εὐριπίδην καὶ Ἀριστοφάνην, τοὺς δὲ νῦν ὑποκριτὰς (οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν δύο) τὸν μὲν δευτεραγωνιστὴν τὸν δὲ τριταγωνιστὴν, αὐτοὺς δὲ τοὺς ποιητὰς τῶν δραμάτων τραγῳδοὺς καὶ τραγῳδοδιδασκάλους.

It has generally been assumed that the note as it stands is hopelessly corrupt. Lambinus, the sixteenth century French philologist, pointed out (in Morelli's edition, quoted by W. Dindorf) an obvious error of transmission and entirely rewrote the central portion.¹ Since his time no serious attempt has been made to elucidate the note; it passes current in its corrupt form if one wishes to prove by the first sentence that in early times the tragic poets were their own actors (though for this we have the superior testimony of Arist. Rhet. III 1), and in the rewritten form of Lambinus if one desires to find in the second sentence a neat statement about protagonist, deuteragonist, and tritagonist. It is my opinion, however, that the note is essentially sound as it stands, with the exception of the clause *τοὺς ποιητὰς*—*Ἀριστοφάνην*, whose displacement Lambinus detected but did not explain; and that it has, besides, a certain independent value in directing attention to a real difference between the usage of "the ancients" and that of a later time in the words *ὑποκριτής* and *τραγῳδός*.

Lambinus saw that Euripides and Aristophanes were mentioned as illustrations, not of *ὑποκριτὰς*, but of *ποιητὰς*; but his transfer of

τῷ θεάτρῳ, διὰ τῆς φωνῆς κηλούμενοι. ἐχρῆν δὲ ἡμᾶς τὸ ἐναντίον, ἐπεὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ (εἰ καὶ ἐν θεάτρῳ MSS) ἡκούσατε ἀμφοτέρων, μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ προσθέσθαι ὡς παραινούντι τὰ χρήσιμα. οὐκ οὐκ ἐμὸς ὁ τόπος; ἐμὴν εἶναι καὶ τὴν ψῆφον ἐχρῆν. ἐκκλησία γὰρ ἦν."

¹ Lambinus deletes *τοὺς ποιητὰς* after *λεγομένους*, transfers *οἷον*—*Ἀριστοφάνην* to the end of the note, omits *τοὺς δὲ νῦν ὑποκριτὰς* entirely, rewrites the second sentence so as to read *οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν τρεῖς, ὁ μὲν πρωταγωνιστής, ὁ δὲ δευτεραγωνιστής, ὁ δὲ τριταγωνιστής*, and finally changes *τραγῳδοὺς* in the last line to *τραγικούς*.

the *οἶον*-clause to a lower position does not explain how *τοὺς ποιητάς* came to be repeated before the *οἶον*-clause. Now it is to be observed that Demosthenes uses within a few lines both *ὑποκριτής* and *τραγῳδοί*. It was the juxtaposition of these two words in the text that led the scholiast to expand his note on *ὑποκριτής* by adding the third sentence, "the poets themselves they called *τραγῳδοί*, etc." We cannot assume for a moment that he fancied that Neoptolemus was a poet—indeed the preceding note on Neoptolemus speaks of him as an actor—or that he really thought that the ancients called poets *ὑποκριταί* while the moderns called them *τραγῳδοί*. Either side of such a statement would have been utterly contrary to the usage of any period. As Neoptolemus was an actor, the first sentence obviously has reference to Demosthenes' use of *ὑποκριτής* where later writers would have used *τραγῳδός*. This consideration justifies the removal of the words *τοὺς ποιητάς*—*Ἀριστοφάνην* from their present context. Where did the intruding clause originally belong? The answer is found in the third sentence of the note. Here the MSS all give *τραγῳδούς*, which Lambinus would change to *τραγικούς*. *τραγικός*, it is true, is the usual late designation of the tragic poet; but the scholiast, who had just explained, in the first sentence, that *τραγῳδός* is now used where the ancients used *ὑποκριτής*, and, in the second sentence, that for the two inferior *ὑποκριταί* the terms "deuteragonist" and "tritagonist" were employed in the ancient writers, logically proceeds to tell what the ancients understood by *τραγῳδός*—the word which he found, besides, in the text which he was interpreting. The *τραγῳδούς* of the MSS is undoubtedly correct. It follows that the clause *τοὺς ποιητάς, οἶον*, etc., was not originally an integral part of the note. I would regard the whole interpolation as originally an independent note on the *τραγῳδούς* of the text, and conceive that it was so placed in the margin of the archetype that it was drawn by a copyist into the body of the preceding note—a common occurrence in the copying of marginal scholia.

We pass now to the second statement of the note. Here we recall an interesting result of the study of Richards in *Class. Rev.* XIV (1900), pp. 301 ff., on the meaning of *τραγῳδός* and *κωμῳδός*, in which he observed that Attic writers of the classical period do not use these words specifically of the actor.¹ Richards, however,

¹ They do not, however, *exclude* the meaning "actor," as Richards concluded, and as "actor of old plays" they occur in fourth-century inscriptions. Starting from a false deduction from the classical usage above referred to,

failed to recognize the fact that, from the third century on, τραγωδός almost invariably denotes the leading actor of a troupe, the protagonist, and especially of a troupe which brought out old tragedies. It is the highest honorific title to which a tragic actor could attain. The scholiast had recognized this usage, and felt that a later writer would have referred to Neoptolemus as a τραγωδός where Demosthenes calls him simply ὑποκριτής. Now if, as the scholiast had observed in the first statement, the ancient writers used ὑποκριτής where later writers used τραγωδός, an explanation was in order of the terms used by the ancients for the other two actors of the troupe of three of the period of the guilds of Dionysiac technitae. And this explanation the scholiast proceeds to give, and with perfect clearness: while the protagonist was called simply ὑποκριτής, the two inferior actors, he says, were called "deuteronist" and "tritagonist", respectively. Lambinus failed entirely to catch the drift of the note when he proposed to change δύο to τρεῖς and inserted ὁ μὲν πρωταγωνιστής, transforming the whole into a general statement of fact from what had been simply a statement of a difference in usage.

The contents of the note as a whole, as an explanation of what the scholiast conceived to be the divergent use of the terms employed in classical and post-classical times to describe the members of the tragic company, may be expressed in tabular form as follows:

	οἱ ἀρχαῖοι	οἱ νῦν
First actor	ὑποκριτής par excellence	τραγωδός
Second actor	δευτεραγωνιστής	ὑποκριταί
Third actor	τριταγωνιστής	
Poet	{ τραγωδός τραγωδοδιδάσκαλος.	

If this analysis is correct, the two notes should read as follows:

ὑποκριτήν:—'ὑποκριτάς' ἐκάλουν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι τοὺς νῦν 'τραγωδοὺς' λεγόμενους, τοὺς δὲ νῦν 'ὑποκριτάς' (οἳτοι δὲ ἦσαν δύο), τὸν μὲν 'δευτεραγωνιστήν', τὸν δὲ 'τριταγωνιστήν', αὐτοὺς δὲ τοὺς ποιητὰς τῶν δραμάτων 'τραγωδοὺς' καὶ 'τραγωδοδιδασκάλους'.

τραγωδοὺς:—τοὺς ποιητὰς, οἷον τὸν Εὐριπίδην καὶ Ἀριστοφάνην.

Richards arrives at meanings for both the classical and post-classical periods that must be regarded as wholly erroneous, as J. B. O'Connor has shown in his recent study "Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting in Classical Antiquity" (Princeton, 1908), Chap. I.

Believing then that the scholiast wrote essentially what is preserved in the MSS, we may raise the question whether or not the three separate statements combined in these two notes are correct in point of fact. 1) It is true that the Attic writers of the fifth and fourth centuries regularly used *ὑποκριτής* and *ὑποκρίνεσθαι* for the leading actor and his function. *τραγῳδός* is not found in this sense in the singular until the period of the actors' guilds, and was probably given currency by the guilds. It is not implied, however, that these terms were not used by classical writers also for actors other than protagonists; the difference of usage is alone important. 2) The second statement is not strictly correct, but the scholiast's error was a natural one and is still current. In his day the usual tragic company probably comprised only three actors, while in the classical period there was no limit to the number of actors employed to bring out a play, so far as we are informed or are permitted by the evidence to assume.¹ But in the long period, from the third century on, during which the *rex gregis* was usually referred to as *τραγῳδός* and the troupe was usually composed of only three actors while the other two were looked upon as his assistants or "synagonists", the actor second in importance may have been called "deuteragonist", and the third "tritagonist". It was not unnatural, therefore, for the scholiast to Demosthenes, recalling the epithet "tritagonist" tauntingly applied to Aeschines as a "third-rate actor", and remembering, perhaps, the metaphorical use of "protagonist" in Aristotle, should have transferred back into the period of Demosthenes and Aristotle what was strictly a later usage. As a matter of fact, as Rees has shown, "deuteragonist" is very rare and confined to late writers and almost always to the meaning "helper", while "tritagonist" is also confined to late writers, except for Demosthenes' use of it, and is always used in allusion to Aeschines, except, possibly, in this scholium. And possibly even here the scholiast had in mind Demosthenes' use of the term. 3) The third statement and the separate note on *τραγῳδοὺς* are, in a general way, correct enough, though not comprehensive nor entirely apropos of the passage in the text of Demosthenes. No exception is to be taken to the

¹For the proof of this statement, and the facts regarding protagonist, deuteragonist, and tritagonist, see Kelly Rees "The So-called Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama" (Chicago, 1907).

assertion that the tragic poets were in ancient times spoken of as τραγωδοδιδάσκαλοι, but they were not often referred to specifically as τραγωδοί, and certainly not in this passage of Demosthenes. Here it has the general meaning, which is more common in the dative, "tragedians", "performance of tragedies". "If you had been witnessing tragedians", says Demosthenes in effect, "you would have acted reasonably in favoring Neoptolemus". While he uses τραγωδοὺς ἐθεᾶσθε of the tragic spectacle, he wishes to suggest to his hearers especially that important element in the spectacle which was analogous to the position of Neoptolemus and himself as pleaders in a public cause before the Athenian people, viz., the contest between the leading actors of rival plays. He is not thinking of the poets at all, but of the protagonists. In the fifth and fourth centuries τραγωδοί is used of the whole company of tragic performers or of the performance itself; but at one time the writer may have in mind especially the poets, as in Plato Cratyl. 425 d, and at another time especially the protagonists, as here. In this sense the passage in Demosthenes illustrates the beginning of the specialization in the meaning of τραγωδός and κωμωδός which was established during the next half-century.

EDWARD CAPPS.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.